



April 2005

## **Higher Education Coordinating Board: Promoting Student Success through Greater Accountability**

At its meeting in March 2005, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) was presented with a proposed accountability framework for the state as required in House Bill 3103 and as proposed in the board's *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education*.

The proposed accountability framework included a section describing context at both the institution and state level. Staff recommends that the framework be adopted as presented in March 2005, with the following exceptions:

- A measure will be added to the "context" section that provides a ratio of degrees earned to the college-age population of the state.
- The institution-specific indicators proposed by Central Washington University in a separate document from the March board packet will be adopted, as follows:
  - External funds for research, scholarship, instruction, and community outreach.
  - Student experiences in research or other creative expression, civic engagement, and internships.
  - Student pass rates on national and state licensure and certification examinations.
  - Graduation rates of under-represented students.
  - Documented improvements in degree programs based upon assessment of outcomes.
- The institution-specific indicators re-submitted by Western Washington University will be adopted, as follows:
  - Students involved in research, scholarly, and creative activity.
  - Six-year graduation rate for students from under-represented groups.
  - Aggregate percentage of financial need met.
  - Persistence rates for community college transfer students with 45-90 credits.
  - Pass rates on national licensure and professional exams.
- Two measures will be added to track the number of associate degrees (academic and technical) awarded by the community and technical college system.

Other minor changes have been made by staff for clarity. A full copy of the new framework is attached for the board's information.

**Next Steps:** Staff will work with the institutions to develop targets, which will be presented to the board in November 2005. As part of this effort, HECB staff will work with the Council of Presidents, legislative staff, Office of Financial Management staff, and staff from the public baccalaureate institutions to discuss the best timing for updating peer lists.

As this board item is being prepared, accountability measures are being proposed in Governor Gregoire's budget. As the budget evolves, staff will monitor the progress of these proposals and include them in the state accountability framework as required.

### **Higher Education Coordinating Board: Accountability Framework**

The new framework includes four main components:

1. A context section, to include indicators that describe student flow through the K-12 and community college systems, as well as other factors that may influence progress toward state goals;
2. Common indicators focusing on student outcomes;
3. Institution-specific indicators describing each institution's unique or mission-specific contributions to state goals; and
4. A timeline that ties accountability reporting to the biennial budget cycle.

In addition, targets will be presented to the board in November 2005 for approval. These targets will be set based on peer comparisons and/or performance over time. Results for each indicator will be communicated via an interactive Web site.

1. **Context:** This section will include indicators that explain the condition of higher education in the state, as well as the unique mission and student demographics at each institution. This information will help policy-makers understand some of the key factors that influence degree production in the state. For example, if students are not graduating from high school, then the public baccalaureate institutions will produce fewer baccalaureate degrees. Data reported will include:
  - State funding/student FTE
  - Degrees earned/college-age population
  - Percentage of state funds allocated to higher education
  - Financial aid/student FTE (or another measure of affordability – such as percentage of family income needed to pay for college)
  - Percentage of 9<sup>th</sup> graders who graduate from high school
  - College participation rates
  - Average WASL scores for 10<sup>th</sup> graders

- Number of students participating in dual-credit programs (e.g., Running Start)
- Percentage of recent high school graduates requiring remedial education
- Proportion of new students from Washington State community colleges (this will be reported separately for each institution)
- Percentage of students earning bachelor's degrees who have earned at least 40 credits from one or more Washington State community college
- Mission, enrollment by race, ethnicity, average age, gender, origin (e.g., high school vs. community college), first-generation status, degree-seeking status, PELL grant status, full-time vs. part-time status, remedial education required, and SAT/ACT or other indicator of academic preparedness, where available, at each institution

2. **Common indicators for the public baccalaureate institutions:** All of the common indicators reported for the baccalaureate institutions will focus on outcomes, specifically on academic degrees awarded. Two of the indicators focus specifically on outcomes for Washington community college transfer students.

Proposed indicator	What will this indicator tell us?
Number of degrees awarded by type (e.g., bachelor's, master's)	Progress toward master plan targets
Number of bachelor's degrees awarded in "high-demand" areas specified by the HECB	How well the state is filling needs in high-demand areas
Degrees awarded/enrolled FTEs	How many FTEs are required, on average, to produce a degree
Six-year graduation rate (first-time, full-time freshmen): comparable nationally	Are Washington students entering public baccalaureate institutions as freshmen graduating at the same rate as entering freshmen in other states?
Three-year graduation rate (Washington community college transfer students with a transfer associate degree): since many transfer students attend part-time, the percentage of students who have not graduated but are still enrolled and persisting toward their degree will also be reported	Are community college transfer students who enter a baccalaureate institution with an associate degree able to graduate, on average, within a reasonable amount of time?
Graduation efficiency: credits required for degree/credits attempted for two groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Non-transfer (less than 40 credits from another institution)</li> <li>▪ Transfer (40 credits or more from one or more community college)</li> </ul>	Are students completing more credits than they need toward their degrees? Is there a difference between non-transfer and transfer students?

**Common indicators for the community and technical college system:** The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) reports accountability data and sets targets for the community and technical college system, with HECB approval. The accountability measures for the two-year college system include outcome measures tied to their multiple missions of workforce training, academic transfer, and adult basic education.

Proposed Indicator	What will this indicator tell us?
Students prepared for work	How many students have completed their vocational program or earned at least 45 vocational-level college credits with a GPA of 2.0?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of technical associate degrees awarded (a subset of students prepared for work)</li> </ul>	Progress toward master plan targets
Basic skills gains	How many students have gained at least one competency level in at least one subject during the year?
Students prepared for transfer	How many students have completed 45 academic credits with a GPA of 2.0, including completion of core requirements typically completed by freshmen at a baccalaureate institution?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of academic associate degrees awarded (a subset of students prepared for transfer)</li> </ul>	Progress toward master plan targets

3. **Institution-specific indicators:** Each institution will submit performance data related to its unique or mission-specific contributions to state goals, as follows:

**Central Washington University**

- External funds for research, scholarship, instruction, and community outreach.
- Student experiences in research or other creative expression, civic engagement, and internships.
- Student pass rates on national and state licensure and certification examinations.
- Graduation rates of under-represented students.
- Documented improvements in degree programs based upon assessment of outcomes.

**Eastern Washington University**

- Increase student participation in field experiences and internships.
- Increase percentage of degree programs that:
  - Identify and assess student learning outcomes
  - Collect, analyze, and use data for program improvement
- Increase targeted program access for placebound students through site-based cohorts and distance learning opportunities.

**Eastern Washington University** (continued)

- Increase diversity recruitment and retention of faculty and staff.
- Improve retention/persistence rates for all classes:
  - Freshmen to sophomores
  - Sophomores to juniors
  - Juniors to seniors
  - Seniors to graduates
- Hours of student service to the community.

**The Evergreen State College**

- Percentage of seniors who have done or plan to do community service or volunteer work prior to graduation.
- Percentage of seniors who have done or plan to do practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment prior to graduation.
- Percentage of undergraduate degree recipients who earn more than 125 percent of the credits required for their degree.
- The number of “upside-down” degree completions.

**University of Washington**

- Affordable access:
  - Graduation rates of under-represented students
  - The percentage of undergraduates who are Pell grant recipients
- Faculty productivity:
  - The number of programs ranked in the top 20 nationally
  - The number of national faculty and academic awards
- Economic development:
  - Total dollar value of direct research contracts/awards
  - The number of new technologies produced each year

**Washington State University**

- Pass rates on national licensure and professional exams.
- Number of student experiences in research or other creative scholarship with faculty, internships, international study, and community service learning.
- Percentage of degree programs documenting improvements in instruction and pedagogy based on assessment of outcomes.
- Amount of extramural funding received for research and scholarship (in millions).
- Number of jobs directly and indirectly supported by research funding.

**Western Washington University**

- Students involved in research, scholarly, and creative activity.
- Six-year graduation rate for students from under-represented groups.
- Aggregate percentage of financial need met.
- Persistence rates for community college transfer students with 45-90 credits.
- Pass rates on national licensure and professional exams.

4. **Timeline tied to budget planning:** Under the new framework, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the public baccalaureate institutions will report accountability plans in sync with the state's budgeting cycle, as required by House Bill 3103. The overall framework will be evaluated every four years, with the development of the HECB strategic master plan. This will ensure that accountability is systematically linked to state goals.

## **Other Improvements**

### ***Baselines and Targets***

Currently, the public baccalaureate institutions use a three-year average to calculate a baseline for each measure, from which targets are derived. This convention will continue to be used; but, where available, a baseline built on national data or data related to each institution's peer group will be developed. The target for each measure will meet or exceed the baseline. The two-year colleges base their targets on the funding they receive and will continue to use this method. Where possible, targets set by the *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* will be used (e.g., for overall degree production).

The first new set of targets will be submitted to the HECB by the public baccalaureate institutions and SBCTC in November 2005 for the 2005-07 biennium, and will require board approval.

### ***Peer Groups***

Each public baccalaureate institution will continue to use its existing peer group list. HECB staff will work with the Council of Presidents, legislative staff, Office of Financial Management staff, and staff from the public baccalaureate institutions to discuss the best timing for updating peer lists in the future.

### ***Communication***

Results will be communicated using a format developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) – a Web site that includes not only performance for each indicator, but trends, information about how the measures can be used for policy decisions, and detailed information about how the measures are calculated.

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-04**

WHEREAS, In its *2004 Strategic Master Plan for Higher Education* (Section 11), the Higher Education Coordinating Board states its intent to “develop and implement a higher education model that measures progress toward state goals;” and

WHEREAS, RCW 28B.276.070(1) directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to “establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of long-term performance goals in higher education;” and

WHEREAS, The board has reviewed the proposed framework or “system,” including plans for a new context section, common and institution-specific measures, and timeline tied to the budget cycle; and

WHEREAS, The board recognizes that targets will be presented for its review in November 2005 and that staff will begin exploring the possibility of new peer lists;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the new statewide accountability framework.

Adopted:

April 5, 2005

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gene Colin, Secretary